

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Installation of a 22" water main pipeline under the Milk River streambed.	Proposed Implementation Date: Summer 2019
Proponent: City of Glasgow, 319 3 rd St. S, Glasgow, MT 59230	
Type and Purpose of Action: The proponent proposes to install an underground water transmission pipeline, 22" in diameter, to replace a damaged water main line for the transmission of potable water from the source (Missouri River) to the town of Glasgow. The line will be bored under the streambed of the Milk River.	
Location: NW4NW4 of Section 28, Township 28N, Range 40E	County: Valley

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	Bob Kompel, City of Glasgow Public Works Director, contacted the Glasgow Unit Office about the project in the winter of 2017. After discussing the project and determining the need for application for Right-of-Way, an application was submitted in summer 2018.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	Montana Natural Streambed and Land Preservation Act (310 Permit): Permit issued by MT DNRC. Montana Stream Protection Act (SPA 124 Permit): Permit waived by MT DFWP. City or County Floodplain Development Permit: Permit applied for through Valley County Floodplain Administrator. Federal Clean Water Act (404 Permit) and Federal Rivers and Harbors Act (Section 10 Permit): Permit waived by USACE. Short-Term Water Quality Standard for Turbidity (318 Authorization): Permit waved by MT DFWP.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	<p>Action Alternative: Grant permission to the City of Glasgow to install the pipeline under the Milk River streambed.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Deny permission to the City of Glasgow to install the</p>

pipeline under the Milk River streambed.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compatible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	<p>The area of impact consists of bedrock underneath the streambed of the Milk River.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The streambed itself will see no impacts, except in the unlikely case that there is an issue during boring of the line. This is because the line will be bored through solid bedrock at least 15' below the grade of the streambed.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no changes to soils or geologic features under the streambed.</p>
5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?	<p>The pipeline crosses the Milk River, an important water resource. The potential for degradation of water quality has been addressed in the various permits issued and/or waived by the USACE, DFWP and DNRC Water Resources Division.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed project would not negatively impact the quality, quantity and distribution of water.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative, there will be no impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution.</p>
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	<p>This project is not influenced by any air quality regulations or zones.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This pipeline is underground and will have no impact on air quality.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	alternative there will be no impacts to air quality.
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	<p>The area of impact is underground, and no vegetation is present.</p> <p>Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the underwater vegetative community on the streambed.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plant communities on the streambed.</p>
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	<p>The Milk River provides habitat for various important fish species. The streambed is an important component of that habitat.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The line will be bored under the streambed and only a catastrophic failure would result in any impacts to the Milk River streambed habitat.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the possible use of the streambed as fish habitat.</p>
9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?	<p>The area of impact does not consist of any sensitive or specially identified habitat. The following species of special concern are listed as being present within the Milk River: Northern Redbelly Dace, Blue Sucker, Iowa Darter, Northern Pearl Dace, Paddlefish, Sauger and Pallid Sturgeon.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The line will be bored under the streambed and only a catastrophic failure would result in any impacts to the Milk River streambed habitat.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the environmental resources</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	identified.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	<p>The area of impact is fairly deep underground, so no historical or archaeological resources are present.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed project will have no impact on historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to historical or archaeological sites under this alternative.</p>
11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	<p>The proposed pipeline is underground and will not be visible. The project is in a relatively sparsely-populated area.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The aesthetics of the area will not change at all after project completion.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to aesthetics associated with the area.</p>
12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	<p>Environmental resources in the area are not specifically limited and are not affected by the proposed project. No nearby activities will affect the project.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed project will place no additional demands on any environmental resources in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no demands placed on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.</p>
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	There are currently no other studies, plans or projects on this area that are pertinent to this project.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Action Alternative: This project will not impact any other plans or studies that Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has on the streambed.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plans or studies that Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has on the streambed.

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCE

POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?

Action Alternative: The installation of this line carries inherent safety risks that are present no matter what.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to human health or safety.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?

The streambed itself is not managed for any industrial, commercial or agricultural activities.

Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to industrial, commercial or agricultural activities.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to industrial, commercial or agricultural activities on the streambed.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.

Action Alternative: The project will not create nor impact any jobs in the area.

No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to quantity and distribution of employment under this alternative.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX

Action Alternative: The project will

REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	<p>have no impacts on the local and state tax base and tax revenues.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the local and state tax base under this alternative.</p>
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will increase vehicle traffic in the area during installation. There would be no additional demand for governmental services.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no additional demand for government services.</p>
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	<p>There are no special DNRC Trust Lands management plans in effect for the Milk River streambed.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project has cleared State (DNRC) management plans.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to locally adopted environmental plans and goals.</p>
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	<p>The Milk River is considered a Navigable River, and this area can be accessed legally from up or downstream.</p> <p>Action Alternative: No changes to public land access or recreational potential will occur.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the recreational values associated with the School Trust land under this alternative.</p>
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the density and distribution of population and housing.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the density and distribution of population and housing.</p>

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	<p>Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the social structures under this alternative.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the social structures under this alternative.</p>
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of this area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity under this alternative.</p>
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	<p>This pipeline project is intended to replace a damaged water main and allow for better city water service for the City of Glasgow.</p> <p>Action Alternative: Allowing installation of the line across the Milk River streambed would have very little economic impact to the School Trust but would provide a much needed service for the residents of the City of Glasgow.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the social and economic circumstances under this alternative.</p>

EA Checklist Prepared By: s/Jack Medlicott Date: 11/15/2018
Jack Medlicott Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action Alternative
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	No significant impacts expected.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:	

☐ EIS

☐ More Detailed EA

☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By: Matthew Poole Glasgow Unit Manager
Name Title

s/Matthew Poole\s Date: December 10, 2018
Signature